



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

one written by John Allan to Poe's brother, William Henry. This bears the date November 1, 1824. In it Mr. Allan deprecates young Edgar Allan's neglect to answer a letter received from William Henry a short time before, complains of his ward's sulkiness and general ill-temper and his lack of affection for his benefactors, boasts that he had given Poe a better education than he had himself received, compares the two brothers to the disadvantage of the younger, and winds up sanctimoniously with a prayer that God may protect and prosper young William Henry—in order that his sister Rosalie may not suffer. This letter is not an original, but is the copy kept by Mr. Allan.

The two remaining letters have to do with Poe's life at the University of Virginia. One of them is from a school-fellow there, Edward G. Crump, of Dinwiddie Co., Va. It is addressed to Poe, and remonstrates with him for delaying to pay a debt that he owed him—a debt which the writer insists it is all the more his duty to pay since it is not a gambling debt. This letter is dated March 25, 1827,—three months after Poe had left the University. The other letter is from George Spotswood, of Charlottesville, to John Allan, asking that he reimburse him for the services of one of his slaves whom Poe had employed while at the University of Virginia. The date of this letter is May 1, 1827.

The bills in the Ellis-Allan papers are five in all. Four of these are for Poe's tuition at the academy kept by the Clarkes in Richmond—three of them being made payable to J. H. Clarke, and one to J. W. Clarke, apparently a predecessor of J. H. Clarke. The period covered by the first of these bills is June 11 to September 11, 1821; by the second, September 11, 1821, to March 11, 1822; by the third, June 11 to September 11, 1822; by the fourth, September 11 to December 11, 1822. In three of these bills, the item of "Pens, Ink, and Paper" appears, and in one of them charge is made for a Horace and for a Cicero's *De Officiis*. The remaining bill is not against Mr. Allan, but against Poe (spelled *Powe* twice in the document), and for tailor's articles to the amount of \$68.46. Among items included are one "cut velvet vest," one "pair Drab Pantaloon and Trimmings," one "Set Best Gilt Buttons," and three yards of "Linin," with a like amount of "Super Blue Cloth." The bill is not dated, but probably belongs to Poe's college period.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

*The University of Texas.*

PALAESTRA, LXXXIV.

*To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.*

SIRS:—The filosofical basis of Novalis' esthetic theories is the subject of volume 84 of *Palaestra* (E. Havenstein, *Friedrich von Hardenbergs ästhetische Anschauungen*, Berlin, 1909). The book contains many new and stimulating theories especially with regard to Novalis' relation to Fichte, who, according to Havenstein, had by no means as much influence in determining the content of Novalis' ideas as is generally supposed. It is rather to Hemsterhuis that one must look for the fundaments of the Romantic filosofical system. The great significance of Hemsterhuis in the development of Romantic thinking in Germany has long been known but it has remained for Havenstein and Kircher in his recent brilliant study of the filosofy of the Romantic School in Germany to bring out the details.

Not only did Novalis not really accept Fichte's doctrine of the difference between the *ich* and the *nicht-ich*, but he did not even thoroly digest Fichte's general doctrins as the notes from his Fichtean reading clearly show. For Novalis, the barrier between the *ich* and the *nicht-ich* does not exist and all filosofising is self-contemplation without any reference to the external ego. The difference between the two egos is non-existent or at least if it must be predicated, according to Novalis' scheme, it can also be overcome. From this point of view it is an easy step to the Romantic doctrine of *Willkür* and of the miraculous as parts of the inner world of fancy. Hence too, Novalis' glorification of mathematics as the highest form of this *Willkür*.

The ultimate basis of reality is in the feelings alone and these with the unconditioned freedom of the imagination are the material and birthright of the Romantic personality. The poet and the filosofer are two parts of the same thing. The poet takes his material and treats it inwardly but absolutely independently (*Pluspoesie*) the filosofer treats it objectively.

The book also discusses Novalis' theory of the "Märchen," of transcendental poetry, and gives a definition of "romantic" from Novalis' point of view without adding much to the subject. Prefix to the discussion of the esthetic theories is a very important attempt at a redating and rearrangement of the Fragments. Havenstein shows three periods in Novalis' chirography and arranges the Fragments accordingly. This arrangement will prove a definitiv check on Heilborn's edition which has already been so sharply criticized by Walzel and Minor.

GEORGE H. DANTON.

*Stanford University.*